§219.24

strategies. Additionally, the responsible official must provide for an independent, scientific peer review of plan monitoring on at least a biennial basis to validate adherence to appropriate protocols and methods in collecting and processing of monitoring samples and to validate that data are summarized and interpreted properly.

(2) When appropriate and practicable, the responsible official should include scientists in the review of monitoring data and analytical results to determine trends relative to ecological, economic, or social sustainability.

§ 219.24 Science consistency evaluations.

- (a) The responsible official must ensure that plan amendments and revisions are consistent with the best available science. The responsible official may use a science advisory board (§219.25) to assist in determining whether information gathered, evaluations conducted, or analyses and conclusions reached in the planning process are consistent with the best available science. If the responsible official decides to use a science advisory board, the board and the responsible official are to jointly establish criteria for the science advisory board and the responsible official to use in reviewing the consistency of proposed plan amendments and revisions with the best available science.
- (b) The science advisory board is responsible for organizing and conducting a scientific consistency evaluation to determine the following:
- (1) If relevant scientific (ecological, social, or economic) information has been considered by the responsible official in a manner consistent with current scientific understanding at the appropriate scales;
- (2) If uncertainty of knowledge has been recognized, acknowledged, and adequately documented; and
- (3) If the level of risk in achievement of sustainability is acknowledged and adequately documented by the responsible official.
- (c) If substantial disagreement among members of the science advisory board or between the science advisory board and the responsible official is identified during a science consist-

ency evaluation, a summary of such disagreement should be noted in the appropriate environmental documentation within Forest Service NEPA procedures.

§219.25 Science advisory boards.

- (a) National science advisory board. The Forest Service Deputy Chief for Research and Development must establish, convene, and chair a science advisory board to provide scientific advice on issues identified by the Chief of the Forest Service. Board membership must represent a broad range of scientific disciplines including, but not limited to, the physical, biological, economic, and social sciences.
- (b) Regional science advisory boards. Based upon needs identified by Regional Forester(s) or Research Station Director(s), the Forest Service Research Station Director(s), should establish and convene science advisory boards consistent with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. app.) to provide advice to one or more Regional Foresters regarding the application of science in planning and decision-making for National Forest System lands. At least one regional science advisory board must be available for each national forest and grassland. The Station Director(s) must chair the board or appoint a chair of such boards. The geographical boundaries of the boards need not align with National Forest System Regional boundaries. Board membership must represent a broad range of science disciplines including, but not limited to, the physical, biological, economic, and social sciences. Regional science advisory board tasks may include, but are not limited, to:
- (1) Evaluating significance and relevance of new information related to current plan decisions, including the results of monitoring and evaluation; and
- (2) Evaluating science consistency as described in §219.24.
- (c) Work groups. With the concurrence of the appropriate chair and subject to available funding, the national or regional science advisory boards may convene work groups to study issues and provide recommendations.